1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	W. James Young, Esq. Glenn M. Taubman, Esq. (Pro Hac Vice) c/o National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation, Inc. 8001 Braddock Road, Suite 600 Springfield, Virginia 22160 (703) 321-8510 Facsimile — (703) 321-9319 Scott A. Wilson, Esq. California Bar No. 073187 711 8th Avenue, Suite C San Diego, California 92101 (619) 234-9011 Facsimile — (619) 234-5853 Attorneys For Defendant-Intervenor	
11 12		S DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Service Employees International Union, Local 790, Plaintiff, v. Joseph P. Norelli, Individually, and in his capacity as Regional Director, National Labor Relations Board, Region 20; et al., Defendants.	CASE No. 3:07-cv-2766 PJH DECLARATION OF W. JAMES YOUNG, ESQ., IN SUPPORT OF PROSPECTIVE DEFENDANT-INTERVENOR'S REPLY TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE AND MOTION TO SHORTEN TIME HEARING DATE: Wednesday, 11 July 2007 TIME: 9:00 a.m. COURTROOM OF JUDGE HAMILTON, COURTROOM 3, 17TH FLOOR
21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	declares as follows: 1. My name is W. James Young, Esq. forth herein, and if called to testify could do so co 2. I am admitted to practice before the Rule 11-1(a), N.D.CAL., having been admitted to	e Bar of this Court under the provisions of Local practice under an earlier version of the Local Rules ation in response to the multiple misrepresentations
4 0	The state of the s	(

10

13

15

16

17

18

19 **20**

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

- I am attorney for prospective Defendant-Intervenor Stephen J. Burke, Jr., in the above-3. referenced action. At no time have I ever represented Mr. Burke regarding any other matter, in this or any other forum.
- 4. Contrary to the misrepresentations of Mr. Rosenfeld's Declaration, ¶ 6, I am not "counsel for the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation, Inc." The Foundation is my employer. I do not represent it in this case, and the Foundation is neither a party to, nor does it seek in, this case. It is not an attorney, nor is it a law firm. It is, rather, a charitable legal aid organization pursuant to § 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code providing free legal aid to victims of compulsory unionism abuses. These facts are well known to Mr. Rosenfeld, as he frequently tries to make the Foundation an issue in cases in which his clients are violating the statutory and/or constitutional rights of employees who, as a result thereof, receive free legal aid provided by the Foundation.
- 5. Mr. Rosenfeld's second misrepresentation is his claim that "On June 4, 2007, [I] ... informed [Mr. Rosenfeld] via electronic mail that [I] did not intend to produce [my client] for ... deposition." Clerk's Docket No. 25, ¶ 8. Actually, as clearly shown on the printed version of my email communication, attached to Mr. Rosenfeld's Declaration as Exhibit B, my response was dated and sent on 1 June 2007, at 9:05 p.m. [6:05 p.m., P.D.T.]. The time on the document represents Eastern Daylight Time. It was sent less than two hours after Mr. Rosenfeld sent his electronic copy of his Notice of Deposition, at approximately 7:21 p.m., E.D.T. [4:21, P.D.T.].
- 6. Mr. Rosenfeld's third misrepresentation is his claim that I "never responded to my letter" dated 4 June 2007. Clerk's Docket No. 25, ¶ 10. Actually, I responded to Mr. Rosenfeld's letter by e-mail on the same day, and a few hours later, as I spent the bulk of the day in Pittsburgh, defending three depositions. A printed version of my e-mail, of which a courtesy copy was sent to one other individual in Mr. Rosenfeld's firm, is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit A.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on 11 June 2007.

	/s/ W. James Young	
W JAMES YOUNG		